

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 1-6, 12, 23-28, 32-34, 39-41, 45, 52-54 and 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of "The Many Faces of Publish/Subscriber" (hereinafter "Many Faces").

Claims 7-9, 29-31 42-44 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Many Faces and Jantz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,487,677 (hereinafter "Jantz").

Claims 11, 22, 37 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Many Faces and Gibson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,343,236 (hereinafter "Gibson").

Claims 13-14 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Many Faces and Gibson and in further view of Wikipedia's Cache article (hereinafter "Cache Article").

Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Many Faces, Gibson, the Cache Article and in further view of Koseki et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,732,124 (hereinafter "Koseki").

Claims 17-18, 21, 55 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Many Faces and in further view of Coale, U.S. Patent No. 4,922,491 (hereinafter "Coale").

Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Many Faces and Coale as applied to Claim 17 and in further view of Jantz.

Claims 38 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Many Faces and Gibson and in further view of Koseki.

Claims 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Many Faces and Jantz as applied to Claim 48 and in further view of Gibson.

Claims 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chan in view of Many Faces and Jantz as applied to Claim 48 and in further view of Gibson and Koseki.

Applicants disagree with all of the obviousness rejections. In particular, amended intervening Claim 1 is at least allowable because it now includes the objected to subject matter of dependent Claim 10 and the subject matter of base independent Claim 61. Also, dependent Claims 2-9 and 11- 25 are also allowable for at least the same reasons as amended Claim 1, upon which they all now depend. Additionally, the obviousness rejections for Claims 26-59 are now moot at least because of the instant amendment, which cancels these claims.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that presently pending Claims 1- 9 and 11- 25 (after this amendment is entered) are now in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that the prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although only certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentable. Applicant reserves the right to raise these arguments in the future.

Dated: August 28, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John W. Branch

Registration No.: 41,633

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(206) 262-8906 • (212) 527-7701 fax

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant